



GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

Chandigarh Administration Gazette

Published by Authority

No. 058] CHANDIGARH, WEDNESDAY, APRIL 23, 2025 (VAISAKHA 03, 1947 SAKA)

CHANDIGARH ADMINISTRATION
DEPARTMENT OF MEDICAL EDUCATION AND RESEARCH

Notification

The 22nd April, 2025

No. 2025/13501.--In exercise of the powers conferred by the proviso to article 309 of the Constitution of India read with the Government of India, Ministry of Home Affairs, Notification S.O. No. 3267, dated 1st November, 1966, the Administrator, Union Territory, Chandigarh is pleased to make the following rules, regulating the method of recruitment to the posts of Junior Cardiac Perfusion Technician (Group 'B') in the Government Medical College and Hospital, Chandigarh, namely :-

- Short title and commencement:-** (i) These rules may be called the Government Medical College and Hospital, Chandigarh (Group-B) posts i.e. Junior Cardiac Perfusion Technician (Non-Ministerial) Recruitment Rules, 2025.
(ii) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.
- Application:**
These rules shall apply to the posts specified in column No.1 of the Schedule annexed to these rules.
- Number of posts, classification and scale of pay:-**
The number of posts, their classification and the scales of pay shall be as specified in columns 2 to 4 of the said Schedule.
- Method of recruitment, age limit and qualification, etc:-**
The method of recruitment to the said posts, age limit, qualifications and other matters connected therewith shall be as specified in columns 5 to 13 of the said Schedule.
- Disqualification: No person:**
 - who has entered into or contracted a marriage with a person having a spouse living; OR
 - who, having a spouse living, has entered into or contracted a marriage, with any person, shall be eligible for the appointment to the said posts:

Signature Not Verified

Digitally signed by
SURESH BAL
Date: 2025.04.23
15:57:45 IST
Reason: Published
Location:

Provided that the Administrator, Union Territory of Chandigarh may, if satisfied that such marriage is permissible under the personal Law applicable to such person and other party to the marriage and there are other grounds for so doing, exempt, any person from the operation of this rule.

(619)

This is Digitally Signed Gazette. To verify, visit :

<https://egazette.chd.gov.in>

6. Power to relax:-

Where the Administrator, Union Territory, Chandigarh is of the opinion that it is necessary or expedient so to do, he may, by order, for reasons to be recorded in writing and in consultation with the Union Public Service Commission, relax any of the provisions of these rules in respect of any class or category of persons.

7. Savings:-

Nothing in these rules shall affect reservations, relaxation of age limit and other concessions required to be provided for Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes, Other Backward Classes, Ex-Servicemen and other special categories of persons in accordance with the orders issued by Central Government from time to time in this regard.

Secretary MER,
Chandigarh Administration.

1	Name of the Post	Junior Cardiac Perfusion Technician
2	No. of Post	2 (2024) *Subject to variation dependent on workload
3	Classification	General Central Service Non Ministerial Non-Gazetted Group, B
4	Pay Band and Grade Pay/Pay Scale	Level- 6 (Rs. 35400-112400) in pay matrix of 7 th CPC
5	Whether selection post or non- selection post	Not Applicable
6	Age limit for direct recruits	Not exceeding 30 Years (Relaxable for govt servants upto 5yrs in accordance with instructions or orders issue by central govt.) Note : The crucial date for determining the age-limit shall be as advertised by the Competent Authority.
7	Educational and other qualifications required for Direct recruits	Essential Qualification: Bachelors Degree in Perfusion Technology from recognized University or institute; or Two years Post Graduate Diploma in Perfusion Technology from a recognised university or institute; or Master Degree in Perfusion Technology from recognized University or institute. Note: The direct recruits have to submit the certificate of training in Information Communications Technology (ICT) Skills of 126-200 hours at the time of their appointment, as per instructions issued by Chandigarh Administration Vide No. 28/69-IH(12)/Pers. Trg.- 2019/ 17927 dated 25th November 2019. Qualification Standard Note: Qualifications are Relaxable at the discretion of the S.S.C/Competent Authority, for reasons to be recorded in writing, in the case of candidates otherwise well qualified.
8	Whether age and educational qualifications prescribed for direct recruits will apply in the case of promotees	AGE: NA Edu. Qual: NA
9	Period of probation, if any	Two years Remark: There shall be a mandatory induction training of at least two weeks duration for successful completion of the probation as prescribed by the Competent Authority.
10	Method of Recruitment whether by direct recruitment or by promotion or by deputation/ absorption and percentage of the vacancies to be filled by various methods	100% Direct Recruitment Note: Vacancies caused by the incumbent being away on deputation or long illness or study leave or under other circumstances for a duration of one year or more may be filled on deputation basis from officers of Central Government. (i) holding analogous post on regular basis in the parent cadre / department; and (ii) Possessing the qualifications and experience prescribed for direct recruits under Col. 7.

		Period of deputation including period of deputation in another ex-cadre post held immediately preceding this appointment in the same or some other organization/ department of the Central Government shall ordinarily not to exceed three years. The maximum age limit for appointment by deputation (ISTC) shall be not exceeding 56 years as on the closing date of receipt of applications.
11	In case of recruitment by promotion/ deputation/ absorption, grades from which promotion/ deputation/ absorption to be made	Not Applicable
12	If a Departmental Promotion Committee exists, what is its composition	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Departmental Promotion Committee</u> <u>Not Applicable (Chairman)</u></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Departmental Confirmation Committee</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Secretary Medical Education & Research, Chandigarh Administration –Chairman 2. Special/ Additional/ Joint Secretary (Personnel), Chandigarh Administration –Member 3. Director Social Welfare or their representative–Member 4. Regional Employment Officer or their representative–Member
13	Circumstances in which Union Public Service Commission to be consulted in making Recruitment	Consultation with UPSC is not necessary.

CHANDIGARH ADMINISTRATION
LABOUR DEPARTMENT**Notification**

The 16th April, 2025

No. 508149-HII(2)-2025/5940.—In exercise of the Powers conferred by sub-section (i) of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. 14 of 1947) read with Government of India, Ministry of Labour & Employment's Notification No. S-11025/21/2003-IR(PL) dated 28.7.2004, the undersigned hereby publish the following award bearing reference No. **103/2020** dated **27.02.2025** delivered by the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, UT Chandigarh between :

SAROJ W/O SH. SHYAM LAL, AGED 50 YEARS, R/O HOUSE NO.42, GATE NO.3, VILLAGE KHRAD MANGOLI, OLD PANCHKULA. (WORKMAN)

AND

VEDIC GIRLS SENIOR SECONDARY SCHOOL, NEAR PANNA SWEETS, MANIMAJRA, CHANDIGARH THROUGH ITS DIRECTOR/OCCUPIER. (MANAGEMENT)

AWARD

1. Saroj, workman has presented industrial dispute under Section 2A(2) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (*here-in-after in short called 'ID Act'*).

2. Briefly stated the averments of claim statement are that the workman was appointed as Sweeper by the Vedic Girls Senior Secondary School (*here-in-after 'management'*). The workman was not issued appointment letter. The workman was paid monthly wages of ` 6,950/- in cash after deduction of provident fund. The wages of the workman were less than the minimum notified wages. The workman remained in continuous employment of the management up to 24.08.2018. During tenure of service, there was no complaint against the work & conduct of the workman. The workman was not issued leave card and attendance card. On 25.08.2018, the services of the workman were terminated with verbal order without notice. The management neither issued any memo, charge sheet nor conducted any inquiry into the matter before terminating the services of the workman. The management has neither offered notice pay nor paid compensation under Section 25F of the ID Act. Workman verbally requested many times to the concerned officer to take her back on duty but the management refused. From the date of termination, till date the workman is unemployed. Workman raised demand notice. The Conciliation proceedings before the Assistant Labour Commissioner-cum-Conciliation Officer, U.T. Chandigarh failed. Thus, the present claim statement. Prayer is made that termination order may be set aside being illegal and the workman may be reinstated with full back wages along with continuity of service and consequential benefits.

3. The management contested the claim statement by filing written statement dated 19.03.2021 filed on 22.04.2021 wherein preliminary submissions are made to the effect that management is a privately managed Government aided school. It receives 95% grant-in-aid from the Chandigarh Administration against the total number of 30 posts sanctioned for this purpose. The remaining 5% salaries for these posts are paid by the school management. In addition to 30 sanctioned posts, there are 20 employees who are working in the management's school in the capacity of private employees and their salary are paid by the school management from its own funds, which is sustained by the fee received from the students. Management school is a school for girls, providing education to student who come from extremely poor households. Pursuant thereof the school charges a nominal fee of ` 250/- per month for the primary school and ` 480/- per month for secondary school. Furthermore, the school regularly grants fee concessions

to many students who are unable to meet the expenses of school fee. This is done by the school management in an effort to make available to every student an equal opportunity to receive education.

4. It is further submitted that the workman was employed by the management school as a private employee on part-time basis at the position of sweeper which she joined on 27.07.2007. The workman was not working against a sanctioned post to receive grant-in-aid from Chandigarh Administration. The workman displayed a negligent conduct in carrying out her duties. The attendance register maintained by the school would show that the workman was in the habit of availing higher number of holidays than the 20 granted to her. The number of holidays availed by the workman are as below:-

<u>Sr. No.</u>	<u>Year</u>	<u>Number of Holidays</u>
1.	2009	27
2.	2010	31
3.	2011	41
4.	2012	38
5.	2014	28
6.	2015	33
7.	2016	33
8.	2017	34
9.	2018	24

Even otherwise, the workman was an unprofessional and in-disciplined employee who did not observe an iota of diligence in carrying out her duties. On 27.07.2018 the Anti-Malaria Department had conducted a drive in the management-school to ensure that the school premises were free from Malaria carrying mosquitos intubating in unclean places or where the water is allowed to stagnate for a prolonged period of time. On conducting the tests, various Malaria and Dengue mosquitos and their eggs were found in the water coolers, refrigerator trays and buckets of stagnant water, which had been left abandoned on the roof by the workman. Since the responsibility of ensuring the maintenance of cleanliness falls upon the Sweepers appointed for this purpose, one of whom was workman. An appropriate circular dated 30.07.2018 was issued to the workman by the management school, whereby the workman was informed that her negligent conduct warrants the contemplation of disciplinary action against her and the same would be duly initiated in the event of further negligence on her part in performance of duties assigned to her. Despite the above circular, the workman did not improve and she continued to create indiscipline in the management-school. Several warning letters were issued to the workman and she was given various opportunities to provide an explanation in her defence. However, the workman chooses not to submit any representation and continued to create indiscipline in the management-school. The workman refused to receive notice of termination and accordingly report to this effect was prepared by the school authorities. However, on sympathetic ground the management school is decided to reconsider the conduct of the workman and accordingly letter of termination was withdrawn. The workman was called in the meeting of management committee held on 26.09.2018. Resultantly, the management issued a letter dated 08.10.2018, whereby the workman was given a second opportunity to join her posting by 15.10.2018. The workman was informed that in case she does not join her posting on 15.10.2018, it would be taken to understand that she is no longer interested in service with the management school. Despite efforts made by the management, the workman did not join her

posting even after being accorded such permission in the meeting dated 26.09.2018 and further despite being called upon to do so by way of letter dated 08.10.2018. In fact, the willingness of the management-school to permit the workman to join her posting may further be evidenced by the fact that the school sent a Sweeper to meet with the workman with a view to ask her to join her posting. However, the workman refused to join her posting. It is denied that the services of the workman were terminated illegally and without issuance of proper notice, without an opportunity of hearing. It is clear that the workman has abandoned her service and cannot now demand reinstatement as a matter of right. The workman has attempted to mislead this Court by way of false and misleading pleadings with a view to harass the management school.

5. Further on merits, similar stand is taken as taken in the preliminary submissions. Rest of the averments of claim statement are denied as wrong and prayer is made that the claim statement may be dismissed being devoid of merits.

6. Replication not filed. From the pleadings of the parties, following issues were framed vide order dated 25.02.2022 :-

1. Whether the services of the workman were terminated illegally by the management, if so, to what effect and to what relief he is entitled to, if any ? OPW
2. Whether the workman was not working against a post sanctioned to receive grant-in-aid ? OPM
3. Relief.

7. In evidence the workman Saroj examined herself as AW1 and tendered her affidavit Exhibit 'AW1/A' along with copies of documents i.e. her identity card vide **Exhibit 'W1'** and her EPF statement w.e.f. 31.03.2010 to May 2018 bearing Establishment I.D./Name PBCHD0007955000/Vedic Girls Sr. Sec. School and Member I.D/Name PBCHD00079550000000036/Saroj vide **Exhibit 'W2'** (consisting of 4 pages).

8. In cross-examination of AW1 the management had put circular No.36 dated 30.07.2018 as **Exhibit 'R1'**.

9. On 29.11.2024 Learned Representative for the workman closed evidence in affirmative.

10. On the other hand, management examined MW1 Poonam Sekhri -Principal, Vedic Girls Senior Secondary School, who tendered her affidavit Exhibit 'MW1/A' along with original letter bearing Ref. No.19612 dated 08.10.2018 of Manager, Vedic Girls High School, Manimajra, Chandigarh on the letter Head of the School posted to the workman under registered cover vide **Exhibit 'R2'** accompanied with original postal receipt dated 08.10.2018 vide **Exhibit 'R2/1'**.

11. In cross-examination of MW1 the workman had put documents Annexure 'R3' and Annexure 'R4' (Annexure 'R3' and Annexure 'R4' were filed along with the written statement). Annexure 'R3' is the copy of written report by C.T. Teacher and Clerk to the Principal of Vedic Girl Senior Secondary School, that Saroj (Sweeper) refused to receive the relieving orders. Annexure 'R4' is the copy of letter bearing Reference No.19612 dated 08.10.2018 on the letter head of Vedic Girls Senior Secondary School, requiring the workman to rejoin duty as part-time Sweeper w.e.f. 15.10.2018, failing which it will be assumed that the workman is not willing to perform duty and management will be free to further action.

12. On 14.02.2025 Learned Representative for the management closed oral evidence and on 21.02.2025 closed documentary evidence.

13. I have heard the arguments of Learned Representatives for the parties and perused the judicial file. My issue-wise findings are as below :-

Issues No. 1 & 2 :

14. Both these issues are taken up together being interconnected and in order to avoid repetition of discussion.

15. Onus to prove issue No.1 is on the workman and onus to prove issue No.2 is on the management.

16. In support of claim statement, Learned Representative for workman referred testimony of AW1 Saroj (workman) who vide her affidavit Exhibit 'AW1/A' deposed the averments of claim statement in toto which are not reproduced here for the sake of brevity. AW1 supported her oral version with documents Exhibit 'W1' and Exhibit 'W2'.

17. On the other hand, Learned Representative for the management referred testimony of MW1 Poonam Sekhri, who vide her affidavit Exhibit 'MW1/A' deposed the entire contents of the written statement which are not reproduced here to avoid repetition. To support oral version of MW1, Learned Representative for the management referred documents Exhibit 'R1', Exhibit 'R2' and Exhibit 'R2/1'.

18. From the oral as well as documentary evidence led by the parties, it comes out that workman was employed as Sweeper with the school management w.e.f. 01.05.2007 to 24.08.2018 on monthly wages of `6,950/-. In this regard MW1 in her cross-examination admitted as correct that the workman remained in the employment of management school w.e.f. 01.05.2007 to 24.08.2018 as a Sweeper. MW1 admitted as correct that the last paid monthly wages of the workman were ` 6,950/-. From Exhibit 'W2' it is further proved that the workman was covered by the management-school under ESI scheme. In EPF record the employer establishment ID and name is incorporated as PBCHD0007955000/Vedic Girl Senior Secondary School and Member ID / name is incorporated as PBCHD00795500000036/Saroj.

19. Learned Representative for the workman argued that workman was full time regular worker and was paid ` 6,950/- per month which was less than the notified minimum rate of wages. To support his arguments Learned Representative for the workman referred copy of workman's identity card Exhibit 'W1' wherein her designation is recorded as Sweeper and not as part-time Sweeper. On the other hand, Learned Representative for the management-school argued that identity card Exhibit 'W1' has not been issued by the school authorities as it does not bear the signatures of any authorised person on behalf of the school. Besides, management-school is a privately managed Government aided school. It receives 95% grant-in-aid from the Chandigarh Administration against the total number of 30 posts sanctioned for this purpose. The remaining 5% salaries for these posts are paid by the school management. In addition to 30 sanctioned posts, there are 20 employees who are working in the management's school in the capacity of private employees and their salary are paid by the school management from its own funds. The workman was working as a Sweeper against a private post on part time basis and she has been paid monthly salary as per her entitlement being part-time Sweeper and the same is in accordance with the notified minimum wages. To my opinion, as far as Identity Card / Exhibit 'W1' is concerned, the seal bearing seal impression 'Headmistress, Vedic Girls High School, Manimajra (Chd.)' is affixed on the same but it does not bear signatures of the issuing authority. The date of issuance of Identity Card is not mentioned. The column of I. Card No. and Blood Group are blank. Thus, Exhibit 'W1' does not carry any authenticity. Besides, the argument raised by Learned Representative for the workman that the workman was paid wages less than the notified minimum wages is devoid of merits because during tenure of 11 years of service the workman never complained to any

competent authority that she is paid less than the notified minimum wages. It is only after the termination of service that the workman raised this issue. The workman failed to controvert the fact that the quantum of salary ` 6,950/- paid to her was against the post of part time Sweeper and the same was as per the notified minimum wages payable to part time worker-Sweeper.

20. Learned Representative for the workman argued that work & conduct of the workman during her entire service was satisfactory. On the other hand, Learned Representative for the management argued that the workman was negligent in carrying out her duty. On 27.07.2018 the Anti-Malaria Department had conducted a drive in the management-school to ensure that the school premises were free from Malaria carrying mosquitos intubating in unclean places or where the water is allowed to stagnate for a prolonged period of time. On conducting the tests, various Malaria and Dengue mosquitos and their eggs were found in the water coolers, refrigerator trays and buckets of stagnant water, which had been left abandoned on the roof by the workman. Thus, the workman along with three co-workers was issued warning letter vide circular dated 30.07.2018 / Exhibit 'R1'. Learned Representative for the workman argued that circular dated 30.07.2018 / Exhibit 'R1' was never served to the workman. To my opinion, the workman has failed to disprove the circular dated 30.07.2018 / Exhibit 'R1' was duly communicated to her. AW1 / workman when put to cross-examination stated that she has seen original Circular Register year 2017-2024 shown to her by Learned Representative for the management, which contains circular No.36 dated 30.07.2018. AW1 further stated that she identifies her signatures at point 'A' of the same against her name at serial No.4 as Saroj and copy of the circular is Exhibit 'R1'. AW1 voluntarily stated that her signatures were obtained under pressure. From the abovesaid version of AW1, it is sufficiently proved on record that the workman has been communicated circular No.36 dated 30.07.2018 / Exhibit 'R1' against her signatures. As per circular Exhibit 'R1', on 27.07.2018, inspection of school premises was conducted by the team of Anti-Malaria Department and the eggs and larva of Dengue mosquitoes were traced for which 4 workmen namely Mewa, Rani, Bimlesh and Saroj were held liable as Mewa failed to keep the cooler clean, Rani failed to keep the fridge clean and the buckets containing stagnated water was found on the roof top and it was duty of Saroj and Bimlesh to keep the roof clean after every 15 days so that water may not accumulate. The workman's plea that her signatures were obtained under pressure, is not acceptable, as no such plea is taken in the demand notice, or statement of claim or in her affidavit Exhibit 'AW1/A'. Thus, communication of warning to the workman vide circular No.36 dated 30.07.2018 is duly proved.

21. Learned Representative for the management argued that despite issuance of warning Exhibit 'R1', the workman did not improve and ultimately her services were terminated vide letter dated 24.08.2018. Thereafter on request of the workman, a meeting was called on 26.09.2018 and the matter was reconsidered and the workman was allowed to re-join by 15.10.2018 as part-time worker vide letter dated 08.10.2018 which was sent to the workman on her correspondence address through post and the same was received back undelivered with the postal endorsement that addressee refused to receive the same. On the other hand, Learned Representative for the workman argued that there is no document showing that the workman requested the management to reconsider her order of termination. In-fact, the alleged meeting dated 26.09.2018 is held and the alleged order dated 08.10.2018 is passed by the management as it failed to comply with the mandatory conditions under Section 25F of the ID Act at the time of passing termination order dated 24.08.2018. Besides, letter dated 08.10.2018 was neither served to the workman nor the workman ever refused to receive the same. To my opinion, the argument advanced by Learned Representative for the workman that the workman never requested the management to reconsider her termination order, is devoid of merits because it is own case of the workman in para 4 and 5 of the claim statement that after termination of her services, the workman requested several time to the concerned authorities / officials of the school to take her back on duty verbally or in writing but the management did not hear her genuine request. Thus, it is proved that meeting dated 26.09.2018 was called and the termination order dated 24.08.2018 was withdrawn and order dated 08.10.2018 was passed on workman's request to reconsider her order of termination and she may be reinstated. Moreover, the meeting dated 26.09.2018 was held and the order dated 08.10.2018 was passed after raising of demand notice dated 04.09.2018 by the

workman. As far as service of notice dated 08.10.2018 to the workman is concerned, the management has alleged that it was issued through registered post but the perusal of undelivered postal envelope Exhibit 'R2' would show that it was issued through speed post which is also a valid mode of service. Exhibit 'R2/1' i.e. original postal receipt would show that notice dated 08.10.2018 was issued on 08.10.2018. As per the postal envelope it was sent to addressee Saroj W/o Shyam Lal, R/o H.No.42, Gate No.3, Village Khrad Mangoli, Old Panchkula. AW1 / workman went put to cross-examination admitted as correct that her address is H.No.42, Gate No.3, Village Khrad Mangoli, Old Panchkula. The perusal of undelivered postal envelope Exhibit 'R2' would show that it bears endorsement that in the village, on enquiry, the address not traced. It is not the case of the workman that except the above address she has any other address for correspondence in the record of the management. The management's burden to communicate order dated 08.10.2018 stands discharged when it sent the order through speed post on the correct address of correspondence of the workman. Moreover, there is no evidence of the workman to substantiate her plea that her appointment was on regular basis against a sanctioned post. On the other hand, the management's plea that the workman was engaged as a part-time Sweeper against the non-sanctioned post stands proved from the fact that the workman was paid monthly wages after deduction of EPF contribution, fully detailed in Exhibit 'W2', payable to the part time workers according to the notified minimum wages of Chandigarh Administration, against which the workman never complained during entire tenure of her service before termination. The part-time worker does not fall within the definition of workman as defined under Section 2(s) of the ID Act. The case law referred by Learned Representative for the management titled ***Uttaranchal Forest Hospital Trust Versus Dinesh Kumar*** reported in **2008(1) SCT 273** is applicable in this case to some extent wherein The Division Bench of Hon'ble Supreme Court has held as under :-

- "7. The basic difference between a person who is engaged on a part-time basis for one hour or few hours and one who is engaged as a daily wager on regular basis has not been kept in view either by the Labour Court or by the High Court. The documents filed clearly establish that the claim of having worked more than 240 days is clearly belied."
8. The stand of the appellant that the respondent was called for work whenever work was available, and as and when required and that he was not called for doing any work when the same was not available has been established. The Labour Court itself noted that the workman was engaged in work by others as he was working in the appellants' establishment for one hour or little more on some days. It is also seen from the documents produced before the Labour Court that whenever respondent was working for full period of work he was being paid Rs.35/- per day and on other days when he worked for one hour he was getting Rs.5/-.
9. In the aforesaid position, the inevitable conclusion is that the Labour Court and the High Court were not justified in directing the reinstatement with partial back wages."

22. Accordingly, issue No.1 is decided against the workman and in favour of the management and issue No.2 is decided in favour of the management and against the workman.

Relief :

23. In the view of foregoing finding on the issues above, this industrial dispute is declined. Appropriate Government be informed. File be consigned to the record room.

(Sd.) . . . ,

(JAGDEEP KAUR VIRK)

PRESIDING OFFICER,
Industrial Tribunal & Labour Court,
Union Territory, Chandigarh.
UID No. PB0152

Dated : 27.02.2025.

CHANDIGARH ADMINISTRATION
LABOUR DEPARTMENT**Notification**

The 16th April, 2025

No. 508159-HII(2)-2025/5944.—In exercise of the Powers conferred by sub-section (i) of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. 14 of 1947) read with Government of India, Ministry of Labour & Employment's Notification No. S-11025/21/2003-IR(PL) dated 28.7.2004, the undersigned hereby publish the following award bearing reference No. **89/2017** dated **20.02.2025** delivered by the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, UT Chandigarh between :

REETU W/O KULDEEP SONI R/O HOUSE NO.59/3, BANK COLONY, MANIMAJRA, CHANDIGARH.

2ND ADDRESS: HOUSE NO. 2238/57, SHANTI NAGAR, MANIMAJRA, CHANDIGARH.
(WORKMAN)

AND

1. M/S TECH MAHINDRA LIMITED, PLOT NO.23, PHASE - II, SEZ, KISHANGARH, RAJIV GANDHI I.T. PARK, CHANDIGARH THROUGH ITS MANAGING DIRECTOR.
2. ANAND MAHINDRA, MANAGING DIRECTOR/S, TECH MAHINDRA LIMITED, PLOT NO. 23, PHASE - II, SEZ, KISHANGARH, RAJIV GANDHI I.T. PARK, CHANDIGARH.

2ND ADDRESS:- M/S TECH MAHINDRA LIMITED, WING 1 AND 2, OBERIO GARDEN ESTATE, OFF. SAKI VIHAR ROAD, CHANDIVALI, ADHERI (EAST), MUMBAI - 400072 (MAHARASHTRA). (MANAGEMENT)

AWARD

1. Reetu, workman has presented industrial dispute under Section 2A(2) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (*here-in-after in short called 'ID Act'*).

2. Briefly stated the averments of claim statement are that the applicant (*here-in-after 'workman'*) was appointed by the respondent (*here-in-after 'management'*). Workman joined her duties w.e.f. 22nd August, 2012 with Bharti Airtel Ltd. till 10.02.2013 and then with Bel Canada from 24.03.2013 till July, 2016 and from 01.08.2016 to 28.09.2016 with H.R. Department on consolidated monthly salary of ` 6,000/- per month. The workman is a 'workman' as defined in the ID Act. The workman has discharged her duties entrusted to her from time to time in an honest and sincere manner, very diligently and used her skill and labour for better functioning of the management. The management was satisfied with her working. On 23.07.2015, the employees of management started pressurizing the workman to leave the job and in this regard a false and concocted story was plotted against her. The workman was harassed, due to which the workman was under trauma and shock, as a result of which her health got deteriorated. The workman was also physically harassed because of which she was forced to file a criminal complaint against the management and the same was later compromised. In the month of May, 2017, the management started pressurizing the workman to resign from the job. When the workman refused to resign, the management illegally terminated her services without giving any prior notice. The workman had worked sincerely for about 4 years with the management but the management did not consider this fact and terminated her services. After termination, the workman raised hue and cry before the management by various

communications including e-mails but the management did not pay any heed and just ignored her humble request and forced her in such critical situation. The management has given false and frivolous reasons of termination. While terminating the services of the workman, the provisions of law have not been complied and no compensation was given to the workman which is violation of Section 25-F of the ID Act. Moreover, offence has been committed by the Company and Section 35 of the ID Act is attracted which clearly states that each and every person associated with the organisation are jointly and severally liable unless the offence so committed is without his knowledge or consent and the person involved in said offence are guilty of such offence. The application is within the limitation period under proviso to Section 15(2) of ID Act. Prayer is made that direction may be issued under Section 15(3) of the ID Act to reinstate the workman with full back wages along with allowances and interest @ 18% per annum from the due date till realisation.

3. On notice, management No.1 contested the claim statement by filing written statement dated 14.03.2018 (filed on 19.04.2018) wherein preliminary submissions are made to the effect that the claimant (*here-in-after* 'workman') has not approached the Court with clean hands and grossly mis-stated the facts and concealed material information to mislead the Court. The workman is guilty of breach of terms of employment, security breach and criminal conspiracy to cheat the management, punishable under Indian Penal Code. The workman fraudulently shared her login password and other credentials with her husband Kuldeep Singh, who was working with the management, to fraudulently get her attendance recorded in the company time sheets, during the period October, 2016 to April, 2017, when she had stopped coming and absent from office continuously for the said period and thus succeeded in getting salary, through bank transfers. The time sheet was tampered and forged deliberately by the workman and her husband in connivance with each other by using Company's computer system, for financial gains and to cause loss to the management.

4. Further on merits, it is denied that workman is covered under Section 2(s) of the ID Act. The workman was appointed as 'Customer Support Associate' on 22.08.2012 for the project of one of the customers of the answering management and later worked on another customer project but never worked with HR Department. Her initial monthly salary was ` 6,009/- (Total cost to company of ` 83,806/-). The workman had lot of disciplinary issues being highlighted by team operations from time to time. The HR Department of the management had issued a written warning to the workman on 13.05.2015 for absence from office without approved / authorised leave. Later the workman was found involved in fraudulent activity in conspiracy with her husband for which her services had to be terminated and police complaint had to be filed against both. It is denied that management started pressurizing the workman to leave the job, plotted a false and concocted story and that she was harassed. The workman was never physically harassed. The workman and her husband had filed a false and frivolous police complaint against the management, whereupon officials were called to the police station and were informed by the police that the issues shall be discussed and resolved mutually. The matter was discussed mutually between the workman and management staff and was resolved amicably as admitted by the workman in Para 4 of claim statement. The management was always cooperative with the workman and also accommodated her requests from time to time. The workman was given training opportunity time and again in October, 2014 management accepted her request to adjust her office timings for three months due to health problems. In September 2016, the workman was informed that she would be aligned to Operations but she categorically refused and informed that she only wanted to be aligned to Resource Management Group of the Company. From 28.09.2016, onwards, the workman stopped coming to office. In the month of October 2016, the Company again sent her communication about her alignment to a process, but she did not respond to the same. Management sent her a reminder letter, in response to which, she came to office and met HR Officials. However, by then the said opening had closed due to delay in responding in time by the workman. The workman was not coming to office to work from 28.09.2016 but it was noticed that workman's time sheets were being filled even though she was absent from office. Upon investigation, it was revealed that her husband Kuldeep Singh used management's computer system on multiple occasions to login to Reetu's account and filled the time sheets

manually using her login password and credentials. During further inquiry, the IP Address of the systems from which Kuldeep Singh logged-in to use Reetu's credentials and password, were discovered. After investigation, it was concluded that workman had wrongfully shared her login password and credentials to her husband in order to fill her time sheets in the Company system for the period October, 2016 to April, 2017 while she remained absent from office for the said period. Through the aforesaid act, the workman succeeded in making illegal gains of ` 57,661/- by getting automatic credit of salary amount to Reetu's bank account, for the said months, causing loss of ` 57,661/- to the management. The disclosure of login password and credentials to another person, itself is a serious breach of the Company policies. An employee shall only use his / her own password and login credentials to access the Company systems. The workman was also guilty for breach of clause 6 (c) of her letter of appointment. The management had to terminate services of the workman on 26.05.2017 on grounds of security breach, conspiracy to defraud the Company and cheating after the said facts were discovered after due investigation. The management also had to file a police complaint against the workman and her husband for conspiring to cheat and defraud the Company. The reasons given by the management for termination were valid and based on evidence and thus, the same were not false and frivolous and are based on evidences collected by conducting detailed investigation. There was no reason for giving any notice or compensation for termination as the workman is the guilty of criminal misconduct of serious nature, for which necessary inquiry and investigation had already been done and there is sufficient evidence against the workman and her husband. The workman needs to produce strict proof of her alleged claim. Rest of the averments of claim statement are denied as wrong and prayer is made that claim statement may be dismissed with costs.

5. Shri Milind Pendse, Assistant General Counsel of management No.2 filed an application dated 10.05.2018 (filed on 17.05.2018) seeking to delete its name from the proceedings. After taking reply from the workman, the above application was allowed vide order dated 22.04.2019 by the Learned Predecessor Court.

6. Replication not filed. From the pleadings of the parties, following issues were framed vide order dated 03.06.2019 :-

1. Whether the services of the workman were terminated illegally by the management, if so, to what effect and to what relief she is entitled to, if any ? OPW
2. Relief.

7. In evidence, workman Reetu examined herself as AW1 and tendered her affidavit Exhibit AW-1/A along with e-mails (colly) vide Exhibit A-1. On 02.05.2024, Learned Representative for the workman closed evidence in affirmative.

8. On the other hand, management examined MW1 Manish Makan, Manager - HR, Tech Mahindra who tendered his affidavit Exhibit 'MW1/A' along with documents i.e. internal emails of the management during the period 12.05.2016 to 18.05.2017 vide **Exhibit 'M1'** (consisting 21 pages), attendance sheet of the workman Reetu for the period from 01.08.2016 to 27.05.2017 vide **Exhibit 'M2'** (consisting of 16 pages) and letter dated 18.10.2016 issued to workman Reetu from Manager - Human Resources, Tech Mahindra vide **Mark 'X'**.

9. During cross-examination of MW1, the workman had put the salary slips for the period April 2016 till November 2016 vide Mark 'W1' to Mark 'W8'.

10. On 28.01.2025, Learned Representative for the management closed oral evidence and on 20.02.2025 Learned Representative for the management tendered offer letter dated 22.08.2012 vide **Exhibit 'MX'** and termination letter dated 26.05.2017 vide **Exhibit 'MX/1'** closed documentary evidence.

11. I have heard the arguments of Learned Representatives for the parties and perused the judicial file. My issue-wise finding are as below :-

Issue No. 1 :

12. Onus to prove this issue is on the workman

13. Under this issue workman Reetu examined herself as AW1 and vide her affidavit / Exhibit 'AW1/A' deposed the averments of claim statement in toto which are not reproduced here for the sake of brevity. AW1 supported her oral version with documents Exhibit 'A1' and Mark 'W1' to Mark 'W8'.

14. On the other hand, management examined MW1 Manish Makan, Manager HR, Tech Mahindra, who vide his affidavit / Exhibit 'MW1/A' deposed the entire contents of written statement including the preliminary submissions which are not reproduced here to avoid repetition. MW1 supported his oral version with documents Exhibit 'M1' to Exhibit 'M3' and Mark 'X'.

15. From the oral as well as documentary evidence, led by the parties it comes out that workman has pleaded that she was appointed by the management w.e.f. 22.08.2012 on consolidated monthly salary of ` 6,000/- per month. On the other hand, management No.1 has pleaded that the workman was appointed on 22.08.2012 as Customer Support Associate and her monthly salary was ` 6,009/-, (total cost to company ` 83,806/-). From the above pleas taken by the parties, it is established that admittedly the date of appointment of the workman is 22.08.2012. From the copy of offer letter dated 22.08.2012 / Exhibit 'MX', it is established that the workman was offered the role of Customer Support Associate (CSA) w.e.f. the date of her reporting on duty and effective from the date of reporting for duty, she will be eligible for the salary, allowances and other benefits as detailed in Annexure 'T' enclosed with the offer letter. From perusal of Annexure 'T', it is proved that carry home monthly salary of the workman was ` 6,009/- and annual salary was ` 72,108/-.

16. Learned Representative for the workman argued that workman remained in the employment of management from August 2012 to May 2017. The work and conduct of the workman during tenure of her service was satisfactory. Admittedly, workman's husband namely Kuldeep Singh was an employee of the management who joined his duties w.e.f. 22.08.2012 and his services were terminated by the management on 23.07.2015. It is further argued by Learned Representative for the workman that the management levelled false allegations against the workman that the workman fraudulently shared her login password and other credentials with her husband Kuldeep Singh and tampered her attendance record to get the benefit of salary for the period October, 2016 to April, 2017 whereas workman has neither shared her login password nor other credentials with her husband moreover, the workman was on the rolls of management during the above period and even after the completion of two projects. To support his argument, Learned Representative for the workman referred cross-examination of MW1 wherein he admitted as correct that two projects were already completed. MW1 further admitted as correct that after completion of two projects, the workman was on the rolls of the management. Learned Representative for the workman laid much stress on the fact that when the workman was on the rolls of the management, the management is bound to pay salary to her for the said period and there was no reason for the workman to tamper with her attendance record in order to get salary for the disputed period. The management on the basis of above false allegations terminated the services of the workman without issuing any prior notice and without payment of notice pay in lieu of notice period and the workman was not paid retrenchment compensation at the time of termination of his services. The workman was neither issued any show-cause notice nor served any charge-sheet and no domestic inquiry was held against the workman in connection with the false allegations of tampering of the attendance record of his wife. In fact, the management pressurized the workman to leave the job and on workman's refusal, her services were terminated illegally and in violation to Section 25-F of the ID Act w.e.f. May, 2017.

17. On the other hand, Learned Representative for the management argued that workman was habitual of remaining absent from duty. At one occasion she was issued warning letter on 13.05.2015 for absence from duty without approved or authorised leave. In September, 2016, the workman was informed that she would be aligned to Operations, to which she refused. Ultimately, from 28.09.2016 onwards, the workman stopped coming to the office. In the month of October, 2016, the Company again sent her communication about her alignment to a process, but she did not respond to the same. Management sent her a reminder letter, in response to which, she came to office and met H.R. Officials. However, by then the said opening had closed due to delay in responding in time by the workman. The workman was not coming to office to work from 28.09.2016 but it was noticed that workman's time sheets were being filled despite her absence from office. Upon investigation, on the basis of internal e-mails / Exhibit 'M1' accompanied with attendance sheets of the workman Reetu for the period 01.08.2016 to 25.05.2017 / Exhibit 'M2', it was revealed that her husband Kuldeep Singh used management's computer system on multiple occasions to login to workman Reetu's account and filled the time sheets manually using her login password and credentials. During further inquiry, the IP Address of the systems from which Kuldeep Singh logged in to use Reetu's credentials and password, were discovered. After investigation, it was concluded that workman had wrongfully shared her login password and credentials to her husband in order to fill her time sheets in the Company system for the period October, 2016 to April, 2017 while she remained absent from office for the said period. Through the aforesaid act, the workman succeeded in making illegal gains of ` 57,661/- by getting automatic credit of salary amount to Reetu's bank account, for the said months, causing loss of ` 57,661/- to the management. The disclosure of login password and credentials to another person, itself is a serious breach of the Company policies. The management had to terminate the services of the workman immediately on 20.05.2017 due to serious misconduct i.e. security breach, conspiracy and cheating for personal gain. To support his contention Learned Representative for the management referred the time sheets of the workman Reetu for the month of October, 2016 to April, 2017 which is part of Exhibit 'M2' and laid much stress on the fact that these were filled manually by workman's husband Kuldeep Singh and not automatically through the access card system. Upon investigation, it was found that the workman's husband Kuldeep Singh was fraudulently filling the time sheet manually of his wife Reetu, while Reetu was absent and not coming to the office continuously for a long period w.e.f. 28.09.2016. To support its plea that internal inquiry was conducted into the matter, Learned Representative for the management referred emails Exhibit 'M1' (colly.).

18. Learned Representative for the workman argued that e-mails Exhibit 'M1' are internal e-mails of the management and at no stage of alleged internal inquiry, the workman or her husband Kuldeep Singh were joined. Any inquiry which is conducted at the back of the workman, without providing any opportunity to the workman to submit her explanation is arbitrary and against the principles of natural justice, therefore, no reliance can be placed on the same. To support his arguments Learned Representative for the workman referred cross-examination of MW1 wherein he stated that during the entire process, he was not part of the Committee. He has no personal knowledge of the domestic inquiry proceedings conducted against the workman. He has not placed on record the charge-sheet, inquiry proceedings and the report forming basis of termination order. MW1 voluntarily stated that he has placed on record e-mails vide Exhibit 'M1' relating to internal investigation for the allegations against the workman along with the attendance record Exhibit 'M2' being part of inquiry and investigation. MW1 further stated that there was no order of the management to constitute the committee for holding inquiry against the workman. MW1 admitted as correct that in Exhibit 'M1' it is nowhere mentioned that signatory on behalf of the management is member of the Inquiry Committee. MW1 admitted as correct that co-workers were enquired in connection with the inquiry proceedings against the workman. MW1 admitted as correct that in the inquiry proceedings the statements of co-workers were not recorded. MW1 stated that most of the officials who sent the above e-mails have left the management. In the inquiry proceedings the statements of

the officials, who have sent e-mails Exhibit 'M1' were not recorded. MW1 stated that the management has not obtained any Expert Report with regard to the alleged allegations against the workman. Learned Representative for the management argued that the workman has committed the serious act of security breach, conspiracy and cheating, due to which by invoking clause 6(c) of the offer letter, her services were terminated vide termination letter dated 26.05.2017 / Exhibit 'MX/1' with immediate effect i.e. 26.05.2017.

19. During course of arguments the facts remained admitted that both workman Reetu and her husband Kuldeep Singh joined the employment with the management on 22.08.2012 on the post of Customer Support Associate (CSA). Services of the workman and her husband were terminated on 26.05.2017 by invoking clause 6(c) of the offer letter dated 22.08.2012 / Exhibit 'MX'. The management has alleged that workman Reetu had not been coming to the office from 28.09.2016. Kuldeep Singh, husband of Reetu by misusing the password and login credentials of Reetu, filled manually time sheets and not through automated access card system, Reetu's attendance for the period October, 2016 to April, 2017, and succeeded in credit of salary amounting to ` 57,661/- in Reetu's account causing loss of ` 57,661/- to the management. Workman Reetu / AW1 when put to cross-examination stated that she cannot name any employee who was getting salary without doing any work. She used to mark her attendance by swiping the employment card in a machine. The said machine could be operated even by affixing bio-metric impressions and when she used to login the computer with her I.D., the concerned branch comes to know that the employee has physically came present. AW1 further stated that the policy of the company marking attendance of employees differs from Company to Company, therefore, she cannot comment if any employee does not mark his presence through any of the above-mentioned methods, he is marked presence. AW1 admitted as correct that she had received e-mail dated 26.05.2017 requiring her to report to office on that day at 02:00 P.M. for meeting at location H.R. Manager and hardcopy of e-mail dated 26.05.2017 is Mark 'W/9'. AW1 further stated that on receipt of e-mail Mark 'W/9', when she was about to leave from home for meeting, she received a phone call from Mr. Utarkash Chhatri and called her at GMCH, Sector 32, Chandigarh and therefore, the meeting could not be held and she did not go to office. From the aforesaid version of AW1, it is established that the workman did not visit the office of HR Manager of the management in pursuance to e-mail Mark 'W9'. The explanation offered by the workman for not visiting the office of HR Manager on 26.05.2017, on account of receipt of another phone call from Mr. Utarkash Chhatri is not acceptable as no such plea is taken in the claim statement. AW1 in her cross-examination partly recorded on 22.02.2023 stated that she joined with Tech Mahindra on 22.08.2012 and worked up to May 2017. AW1 further stated that she does not have any document with her to show that she worked up to May 2017. AW1 further stated that she was working in a project called Bel Canada up to 2016. During 2016, she was discontinued from the said project and she was at home. AW1 voluntarily stated that in 2016 her services were stopped and she was at home and after few months she was called to join in the HR Department. AW1 further stated that she does not have any document to show that she was called by the management to join the HR Department or she worked in the HR Department.

20. From the discussion made above, even if, it is assumed that as per the internal inquiry, the management found that the workman shared her login password and other credentials with her husband and workman's husband Kuldeep Singh has fraudulently used the same during the period October, 2016 to April, 2017 to record workman's attendance when the workman had actually stopped coming to the office w.e.f. 2016 onwards and the workman's husband by tempering the time sheets by using the computer system of the management, succeeded to credit ` 57,661/- in workman's account, in that situation also at the most clause 6(c) of offer letter dated 22.08.2012 is attracted which reads as below :-

"6 (a)

(b)

- (c) *During your employment with the company you will comply with the provisions of the Information Security Policies and Procedures of Tech Mahindra at all times and which shall extend beyond the normal working hours, whether inside or outside the office premises. You will also classify & manage all data under your control & ownership as per company policies. Non-conformation with the Information security policies & procedures, copying software & other proprietary material in use or stored at Tech Mahindra & non-compliance with various legal & contractual requirements pertaining to protection of personal data will be viewed very seriously and will attract strict disciplinary action as per disciplinary procedures of Tech Mahindra."*

21. In the present case, the management has terminated the services of the workman vide termination order dated 26.05.2017 / Exhibit 'MX1' which reads as below :-

"Dear Reetu,

We refer to your employment contract set out in your employment letter dated 22nd August, 2012.

It has been reported that even though you were absent from office since 28th September, 2016, your timesheets were duly filled for the period of your absence from the office and subsequently the salary for the months of October, 2016 to April 2017 has been credited to your salary account.

Investigation in the matter conclusively reveals that your timesheets were being wrongfully filled in the from IP addresses which originated at Tech Mahindra's network and one of the IP addresses belong to Mr. Kuldeep Singh, your husband and also an employee of the Company. You have thereby committed the following serious illegal acts:

- a. Security Breach - By sharing your log in credentials and passwords from time to time with your husband and/or other fellow conspirators. Needless to mention that this is a serious breach and you have knowingly compromised the network security of the company;*
- b. Conspiracy - You have conspired with your husband, Mr. Kuldeep Singh, also an employee of the company, to tamper and forge your attendance records with the Company to cheat and defraud the Company;*
- c. Cheating - You, along with your husband, have cheated and defrauded the company and have caused losses to the Company to an extent of Rs.57,661/-.*

In the above circumstances, your services with the company is being terminated with immediate effect i.e. 26th May, 2017. As a result, you shall no longer be in employment with Tech Mahindra Limited.

The Company also reserves the right to initiate appropriate criminal action against you and other conspirators, if any, as well as recover the losses incurred by the Company."

22. From the contents of termination letter dated 26.05.2017 / Exhibit 'MX/1' it is clearly established that the management conducted investigation into the allegation levelled against workman and her husband Kuldeep Singh by internal inquiry as reflected in emails Exhibit 'M1'. It is undeniable fact that the workman and her husband were not joined in the internal inquiry held by the management. If the management was so concerned about the misconduct of the workman, nothing prevented, to hold an appropriate inquiry after confronting the workman with all allegations, if any, and prove. It would be very convenient for the employer to do away with inquiry by taking the aid of the terms & conditions of the appointment letter. The act of partiality or bias-ness cannot be ruled out. Moreover, in the present case, even as per clause 6(c) of the appointment letter dated 22.08.2012, the management was required to initiate disciplinary action against the workman for violation of security policy etc. but the management has straightway taken punitive action by way of termination of services of the workman without initiating any disciplinary proceedings against him.

23. In view of the discussion made above, termination order dated 26.05.2017 is illegal and set aside.

24. Keeping in view of the peculiar facts & circumstances of the case, length of service of the workman i.e. about 5 years and her last paid monthly salary ` 6,009/-, workman is held entitled to lump sum compensation in the sum of ` 21,000/-.

25. Accordingly, this issue is decided in favour of the workman and against the management.

Relief :

26. In the view of foregoing finding on the issue above, this industrial dispute is allowed to the effect that workman is held entitled to lump sum compensation of ` 21,000/-. The management No.1 is directed to comply with the Award within three months from the date of publication of the same in Government Gazette failing which the management shall be liable to pay interest at the rate 8% per annum on the abovesaid amount from the date of this Award till the date of actual realisation. Appropriate Government be informed. Copy of this Award be also sent to Learned District Judge, Chandigarh in view of Sub-section 10 of Section 11 of the Industrial Disputes (Amendment) Act, 2010 for onward transmission of the same to concerned Civil Court. File be consigned to the record room.

(Sd.) . . .,

(JAGDEEP KAUR VIRK)

PRESIDING OFFICER,
Industrial Tribunal & Labour Court,
Union Territory, Chandigarh.
UID No. PB0152

Dated : 20.02.2025.

Secretary Labour,
Chandigarh Administration.

CHANDIGARH ADMINISTRATION
ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT

Notification

The 9th March, 2022

No. 02.—The Adviser to the Administrator, Union Territory, Chandigarh on the recommendations of Departmental Promotion Committee (Class-I) in terms of Regulation 10.1 (b) of the PSEB Service of Engineers (Electrical) Recruitment Regulation, 1965 as amended from time to time, is pleased to promote Shri Pankaj Kumar Gautam, Additional Assistant Engineers to the next grade of Assistant Engineer in the Electricity Wing of the Engineering Department, Union Territory, Chandigarh on regular basis in the pay scale of Rs.16650-39100 + Rs.5800.00 Grade Pay with immediate effect:

The promotion of the aforesaid officials as Assistant Engineer will be subject to the final outcome of OA No.-060-00445-2020 titled Ajay Dhimnan Vs. U.T. Chandigarh and others which is pending before the Hon'ble Tribunal and subject to the passing of ICT skill within one year failing which their promotion order will be withdrawn as prescribed in the guidelines issued by the DOP vide letter dated 27.05.2020.

He will be on probation for a period of one year from the date of his joining.

(FOR AND ON BEHALF OF ADVISER TO
ADMINISTRATOR, U.T., CHANDIGARH)

(Sd.) . . .,

Executive Engineer (HQ),
For Chief Engineer-cum-SS (Engg),
Union Territory, Chandigarh.

CHANGE OF NAME

I, Kartik Thakur S/o Sudarshan Singh R/o # 110/3, I.T.B.P. Sector 32-A, Chandigarh, declare that I have changed my name from Kartik Thakur to Kartik.

[632-1]

I, Gurnam Singh S/o Kartar Singh R/o H. No. 67, Khuda Lahora Colony, Chandigarh, have changed my minor son name from Ranveer Thakur to Ranveer Singh Thakur.

[633-1]

I, Mohammad Khursheed S/o Sh. Mohammad Shamshad R/o # H. No. 593, Kachi Colony, Dhanas, Chandigarh, have changed the name of my minor son from Mohd. Shahwaiz to Mohd. Saavej.

[634-1]

I, Asha W/o Sh. Kuldeep Singh R/o H. No. 413/1, Gali No. 1, PWT Manimajra, Chandigarh, have changed my name from Asha to Kumari Asha.

[635-1]

I, Anil Kumar S/o Madan Mohan Lal R/o # 386/2, Sector 45-A, Chandigarh, have changed my name to Anil Sarin.

[636-1]

I, Kuldeep Singh S/o Mani Ram R/o House No. 627, Bank Wali Gali Daria, Chandigarh, have changed my minor son name from Bhanu Verma to Bhanu.

[637-1]

I, Omkar Pandey S/o Shyam Bihari Pandey # 1408, Deep Complex, Hallo Majra Chandigarh, have changed my name to Onkar Pandey.

[638-1]

I, Shiv Pyari W/o Ram Bilas # 1448-A, Small Flats Dhanas, Chandigarh, have changed my name from Shiv Pyari to Savitri.

[639-1]

I, Ritoo Kashyap W/o Suresh R/o 517, Sector 16-C, Chandigarh, declare that I have changed my name Ritoo Kashyap to Ritu Kashyap.

[640-1]

I, Shshi Bala W/o Amarjeet R/o 636, New Indira Colony, Manimajra Chandigarh, declare that I have changed my name spelling from Shshi Bala to Shashi Bala.

[641-1]

"No legal responsibility is accepted for the contents of publication of advertisements/public notices in this part of the Chandigarh Administration Gazette. Persons notifying the advertisements/ public notices will remain solely, responsible for the legal consequences and also for any other misrepresentation etc. "